

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
MONDAY, JULY 26, 2004  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

**S050142**

LUCAS (LARRY) ON H.C.

Opinion filed: Petition for writ of habeas corpus  
granted; judgment vacated

Upon finality of our opinion, the Clerk of the Supreme Court shall remit a certified copy of the opinion and order to the Los Angeles County Superior Court for filing, and respondent Attorney General shall serve another copy thereof on the prosecuting attorney in conformity with Penal Code section 1382, subdivision (a)(2). (See *In re Jones, supra*, 13 Cal.4th at p. 588.)

Majority Opinion by George, C.J.,  
--- joined by Kennard, Baxter, Werdegarr, Chin,  
Brown and Moreno, JJ.

**S107885**

D037578 Fourth Appellate District,  
Division One

PEOPLE v. CELIS (RENATO)

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed

On remand, the trial court is to set aside defendant's guilty plea, vacate the order denying defendant's motion to suppress evidence, and to reconsider that motion in light of our conclusions here.

Majority Opinion by Kennard, J.  
--- joined by George, C.J., Baxter, Chin,  
Brown and Moreno, JJ.  
Concurring Opinion by Werdegarr, J.

**S113321**

A092782 First Appellate District,  
Division Four

PEOPLE v. WALLACE (HAROLD AUSTIN)

Opinion filed: Judgment affirmed in full

Opinion by George, C.J.  
--- joined by Kennard, Baxter, Werdegarr, Chin,  
Brown, & Moreno, JJ.  
Concurring Opinion by Moreno, J.

**S069959**

PEOPLE v. LEWIS (MICHAEL B.)

Extension of time granted

to September 22, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 30 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon counsel Tara K. Allen's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by 10/22/2004.

**S126532**D044698 Fourth Appellate District,  
Division One

K. (W.) v. S.C. (G.W.)

Order filed

The motion to seal the petition and appendix is granted. The records are ordered sealed because they involve confidential defense strategy in a capital case. (Pen. Code, § 987.9.) The court finds that an overriding interest overcomes the right of public access to the record; there is a substantial probability the overriding interest will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed; the sealing is narrowly tailored; and no less restrictive means exist to achieve the overriding interest. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 243.1.)